

## RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 31, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 28 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

## UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR SURGEON  
John B. Alsever

NURSE OFFICER TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR NURSE  
OFFICER

Minnie E. Pohe

## IN THE NAVY

## BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

Rear Adm. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 28 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

## DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

William R. McComb to be Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 28, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Great and marvelous are Thy works, Lord God. Let Thy work appear unto Thy servants and Thy glory unto their children. We most humbly acknowledge our sins; forgive us and teach us that every renunciation brings us nearer to upright and courageous living. The years gone by are ours by inheritance; the fruits of the future depend upon our decisions. Lay Thy hand upon us that the welfare of our country may be held in the folds of every conscience, and lead us to carry our obligation to the altar of the Lord. O inspire this Congress ever to safeguard the rights of our citizens, until the waste places of our land shall blossom as the rose. In all our intricate relationships unite us in a fellowship of cooperation for the common good, exercising courtesy, restraint, and honor. We pray in the name of the world's Saviour, whose crown mocks all the diadems of time. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an

amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TOBEY, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MAYBANK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) entitled "An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. McGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday that the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found duly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

## DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

## CALL OF THE COMMITTEES ON WEDNESDAY NEXT DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

## SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the Second War Powers Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 146, to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, SMITH of Ohio, KUNKEL, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House on House Joint Resolution 146 may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record under the title "Seventy-two Pearl Harbors Every Year."

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House today for 10 minutes, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Syracuse Post Standard.

## ROME, N. Y., AIR BASE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to me on reliable information today that the Rome, N. Y., air base and depot is to be put in the inactivated class. On the basis of dozens and dozens of protests that I have received from people in my district due to the economic importance of this great air terminal in the central part of New York State, I protest and protest loudly

to the War Department against such action. This is one of the most important air terminal points in central New York State. Although it is not in my district, the people of my district have gained a great deal of benefit from it. I think it is an economic tragedy or calamity, if you want to put it that way, to have this great depot put in the inactivated class. A large part of upstate New York depends upon this base for air communication with the rest of the country. Let us hope the War Department will find ways and means to keep the Rome airport open.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement on the Centuria mine disaster, together with an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous material.

#### UNITED STATES SHIPS IN EUROPE ON LEND-LEASE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, since the Greek problem has become the burning question of the hour, there have been extremely interesting developments.

Today we are attracted by a newspaper headline: "1,700 United States ships still in Europe on lend-lease." The item states that Russia holds 577 of these vessels. She has returned none of the ships she borrowed from the United States Navy, and further:

The lend-lease ships figure importantly in Navy plans for aiding the anti-Russian bloc in Europe. The Navy already has sold to Turkey eight surplus minesweepers loaned to England and six minesweepers and other vessels to Greece.

Thus the administration in the operation of its complex foreign policy has loaned 577 ships to be used in the service of the communistic states and sold 14 to Greece and Turkey, who, we are told, are in a death struggle defending themselves against communism.

Considering the history of our Government for the past 14 years and the administration's acceptance and adoption of totalitarian ideals as manifested through their planned and controlled economy, it appears that their distribution of ships gives a true picture of their basic and fundamental devotion

to totalitarian practices—577 for, 14 against.

#### NOBODY CHECKS GOVERNMENT PHYSICAL PROPERTY

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries developed the fact that no independent agency or auditor of the Government makes a regular, periodic, or any other check whatsoever as to the physical property purchased by the Government.

After any agency, bureau, or department once secures physical property, no one in the Government or in the name of the Government, not even the Comptroller General, is authorized to check, examine, investigate, or otherwise periodically find out if any such agency, bureau, or department of the Government actually has the physical property in its possession, whether it is given away, destroyed, or otherwise in control of the Government.

There is no check of the physical property of any kind whatsoever, so that any agency, bureau, or department without fear of detection or exposure, can give away, destroy or embezzle physical property belonging to the United States Government; no one has authority in law or otherwise to examine into the physical property transactions of any agency, bureau, or department. In other words there is no check, examination, or investigation of the physical inventories, if any, of the billions of dollars of physical property purchased with the taxpayers' money.

This probably supports the various statements in the newspapers with reference to the waste and destruction of the physical property of the various departments of the Government. I have heard that the Navy deliberately took to sea a deck load of brand new shoes, had them soaked with water and then ordered them destroyed; that the Army destroyed untold thousands of dollars worth of athletic equipment which could have been very well used by the poor youngsters of this country; and that the Ordnance Department gave away hundreds of millions of dollars worth of machinery.

I do not believe that the agencies, bureaus, and departments should have the absolute discretion of giving away, destroying, and passing on the embezzling of physical property, for there is no check of its operation.

I believe the people are entitled to a periodic check and inventory of the use of physical property, the same as the money transactions, as to whether the agency has the property, gave it away or permitted it to be embezzled.

I am including herewith a resolution whereby there will be a periodic audit and examination by the Comptroller General of the physical property now in the hands of the agencies, bureaus, and departments of the Government:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Accounting Office, under the direction of the

Comptroller General, shall receive and examine inventories of property furnished as of June 30 for each fiscal year beginning in the year 1939 and thereafter, by every department, agency, and independent establishment of the United States, and by every corporation owned or controlled by the United States. Such inventories shall contain the following information: (a) The value of all property acquired or disposed of during the fiscal year; (b) the value of all property on hand as of June 30 with an allowance for depreciation of such property; and (c) such other information as the Comptroller General shall direct.

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General shall investigate (a) any matter relating to the acquisition or disposition of property by any department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States, and by every corporation owned or controlled by the United States, and (b) any other matter required to be stated in an inventory.

Sec. 3. The Comptroller General shall make a report to Congress at the beginning of each regular session relative to matters examined or investigated by him as provided in sections 1 and 2 with such recommendations for legislation as he shall deem advisable.

Sec. 4. The Comptroller General is authorized to use officers and employees under his jurisdiction for the performance of the duties provided in this act and to appoint and fix the compensation of such additional accountants, investigators, attorneys, officers, and employees as may be necessary without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

#### VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have here two newspaper articles which I will insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, and which I hope the Members will read tomorrow morning. One is from the Seminole Producer, of Seminole, Okla., and is entitled "Veteran Care Is War Emergency."

The other is from the Washington Times-Herald of today, and is entitled "Move By TABER Blocks Contracts on Vet Hospitals."

The article from the Oklahoma newspaper tells of the deplorable conditions in veterans' hospitals in Oklahoma. It states that hospital beds, nurses, and doctors are not available in sufficient numbers to furnish even the emergency cases hospital and medical care; that there are waiting lists and that a man cannot even get on the waiting list unless he is an emergency case.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I have grilled General Bradley, General Hawley, and the other "sacred cows" over there. They tell me there is no serious congestion to the point where emergency cases cannot be taken care of; but let me tell you what happened in my State just recently. A veteran tried on March 18, 1947, to get in the veterans' hospital at Muskogee, Okla., as an emergency case. The doctors examined him and said he was not an emergency case, and he was put on a waiting list. The veteran died 2 days later on March 20, 1947.



Now we find by the article in the Times-Herald that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has ordered a 2-week's delay in awarding contracts to build veterans' hospitals. We are going to have more deaths of the nature I have referred to. Once more you are going to find that the boys who fought on world-wide battlefronts come home to die on "the battlefields of Republican economy," and Veterans' Administration bungling and red tape.

The newspaper articles follow, and to them I invite your careful attention:

[From the Seminole (Okla.) Producer of March 24, 1947]

#### VETERAN CARE IS WAR EMERGENCY

The war may be over for the average citizen, but it is not over for many thousands of Oklahoma veterans who cannot find hospital beds in the State when they become ill or incapacitated. That condition exists in Oklahoma, according to Dr. D. H. Miller, manager and chief medical officer of the largest veterans' hospital in Oklahoma, at Muskogee.

Hospital beds, nurses, and doctors are not available in sufficient numbers to furnish even the emergency cases hospital and medical care. Those veterans who have not pursued their "claims" through the miles of "red tape" of the Veterans' Administration and secured a decision from that Federal Bureau that they have a physical or mental disability due to wartime service are not to be admitted, according to the latest announcement, except "in cases of life or death."

That "life or death" decision is a difficult one to make. The veteran who was denied admission on March 18 because he was not a "life and death case," but who died on March 20, gives some idea about how difficult it is to make these decisions.

Oklahoma should have additional hospital beds for veterans. More nurses and doctors are sorely needed. These same professions are in demand in almost every community of the State, and private practice offers a much greater inducement than the initiative-killing positions in the antiquated civil service which supplies the personnel for the Veterans' Administration.

Physical facilities are recognized as a problem also. Everyone recognizes that even without the months delay always prevalent when the Government attempts to build a hospital, the job could not be done in time to meet the present emergency, due to shortage of materials and the labor situation in the construction field.

These are all recognized factors which result in no beds for the men and women who fought the Nation's battles. The condition exists, and the responsible officials of Government know all the facts. They do not, however, come up with any practical solution. Their plea that they are planning for new hospitals to be completed some years hence, does not save the life of a single veteran.

These disabled and sick veterans are just as much a part of the recent war as they were when in uniform. This is one of the war's problems, even though the shooting has ceased. Why cannot our Government apply some of the same methods to caring for these veterans which they applied when the Nation went to war without sufficient manpower or sufficient physical facilities?

It was a patriotic duty to serve either as a gun-toting enlisted man, a nurse, or a doctor during those war days. The recognition due a citizen who was fulfilling a patriotic duty was accorded those who answered the Nation's call. Why cannot that be done now, to meet this phase of our unfinished war?

A fine physical plant exists at McAlester, owned by the State. It is not in use. Med-

ical officers of the Army, detailed to duty there, and Army nurses, detailed there, could take care of many hundreds. Borden Army hospital at Chickasha is closed. It could handle several hundred.

Called to duty, the doctors and nurses would respond. "Swivel chair doctors" by the dozens could be assigned from useless branch offices of the Veterans' Administration. Yes, it could be done with some of the same abilities demonstrated during the war being applied now. We doubt the ability of the present Veterans' Administration brass hats to do it, but it should be done.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of March 28, 1947]

#### MOVE BY TABER BLOCKS CONTRACTS ON VET HOSPITALS

Ordering a moratorium on the issuing of new contracts, Representative TABER (Republican), of New York, yesterday forced the Veterans' Administration to hold up its Nation-wide hospital program, the Times-Herald learned last night.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee made his demand for the contract-letting holiday directly to General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, according to high Government sources.

#### BIDS HELD UP TO APRIL 8

Bradley agreed not to accept any bids until April 8 as a favor to the man who controls the purse strings on Capitol Hill, it was learned. Directly affected are two new hospitals for which contracts were to be okayed next week, and for which funds already have been appropriated.

Chairman TABER is reported to have ordered the 2-week moratorium to investigate excessive spending in the hospital program. He could not be reached for comment last night.

Representative ROGERS (Republican), of Massachusetts, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, said she had heard rumors of TABER's action, but had not been informed of it officially.

#### PLEDGES INVESTIGATION

"I can say only that anything which holds up beds for ill veterans is a serious situation," the Congresswoman asserted. "I am planning to look into the matter thoroughly."

Reached at his home in Fort Myer last night, General Bradley said he accepted the responsibility for ordering that no contracts be issued until April 8, but added that he did so at the specific request of the Appropriations chairman.

"I have a mandate from Congress to go ahead with the hospital program," he said, "and construction that is under way already is not affected by Representative TABER's request. However, when he asked that no new bids be accepted for 2 weeks, I agreed."

From several sources it was learned that Bradley did not have to acquiesce to TABER's demands, but that he probably did so in order not to offend the Appropriations Committee head.

#### HOSPITALS BADLY NEEDED

Seriousness of holding up the hospital program—even for a day—was brought into sharp focus last night when it was learned that 3,500 veterans are now awaiting admittance to Veterans' Administration hospitals, and that the Army has 7,000 men in its hospitals that it wishes to discharge into veterans' institutions.

VA authorities have pointed out that the hospital load will increase 20 percent in 5 years and 40 percent in 10 years.

The building program is under supervision of Brig. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, Director of the Military Construction Division, Office of the Chief of Engineers.

#### TAX REDUCTION AND THE BUDGET

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, the House passed the Knutson bill. It has been estimated by tax experts that this will cost the Government \$5,700,000,000.

To avoid deficit spending in peacetime it thereby becomes urgent, more so than ever before, to now cut the budget.

Of the budget remaining for consideration 80 percent are allocations for the Army, Navy, and veterans.

The \$64 question is, How can the majority leadership cut this budget without seriously cutting the military and naval budgets? If the Republican leadership do cut the military budget, they will be running counter to the wishes of the American people. The most recent Gallup polls shows that 60 percent of the people who were asked about it do not favor cutting the military budget. They are more concerned about the problems of peace than they are about reduction of taxes at the immediate time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the people back home are deeply disturbed by the administration's plan to aid Greece and Turkey as a means of blocking the expansion of communism. There is universal sympathy for the suffering which the Greek people are enduring. Our country has not forgotten the heroic defense which the Greek nation presented to the invading armies of Fascist Italy in the war years. Nor are we unmindful of the fact that the sad plight of the Greek people is the direct result of events completely beyond their control.

What disturbs the American people is the effort of our Government to direct our natural sympathies toward these innocent victims of the war to the establishment of a new policy of blockade. Our folks are deeply concerned over the effort to substitute our own Nation for Great Britain as the principal actor in the drama whose plot is the blocking of the Soviet Union's drive toward the west. There is no disposition whatever to sanction the Communist method of economic imperialism in Europe. We do not for a moment accept the Soviet Union's policy of exploiting famine and poverty as the means by which Mr. Stalin and Mr. Molotov expect to communize their neighbors.

But we are vitally interested in the formulation of America's policies, in meeting the issues of our generation. What direction are these policies taking? What are the principles underlying our conduct and determining the role we shall play?

I believe that the White House program is a reaffirmation of the nineteenth century belief in power politics. It is a refinement of the policy first adopted

after the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 designed to encircle Russia and establish a "Cordon Sanitaire" around the Soviet Union. It is a program which points to a new policy of interventionism in Europe as a corollary to our Monroe Doctrine in South America.

Let there be no mistake about the far-reaching implications of this plan. Once we have taken the historic step of sending financial aid, military experts, and loans to Greece and Turkey, we shall be irrevocably committed to a course of action from which it will be impossible to withdraw. More and larger demands will follow. Greater needs will arise throughout the many areas of friction in the world. To be sure, we shall reserve the right to consider each problem on its own merits, but unless we develop a strong and consistent program—a program which we are prepared to back to the limit—the net result will inevitably be a lowering of American prestige and influence and the direct increase of Soviet pressure everywhere.

Let us not lose sight of this fundamental consideration. Unless we do the whole job of blocking Communist expansion and do it alone, we shall defeat the entire purpose of this program. Instead of checking the Soviet Union's rising influence, we run the risk of enhancing it enormously.

The question for Americans to consider is this: Are the probabilities of success in this new undertaking high enough to justify the risk? Are we prepared to pour endless sums of money into Greece, Turkey, and such other areas of the world as may be stimulated by our new policy to require our aid? Are we ready to send military missions overseas in the approved European fashion, recognizing that military missions have historically been followed all too frequently by military forces?

Do we have any alternatives worthy of serious examination? Are there any techniques which offer the prospect of changing the bankrupt methods of power politics, encirclement, and secret alliances? Must we go on muddling through world affairs, repeating in every generation the same ghastly errors of our predecessors?

If we are sincere in the beliefs we so constantly express, there is a new policy and a new organ which represents that policy. We ourselves have been the most instrumental Nation in the world in shaping the instrument of this new policy. The United Nations is new to be sure. But military missions and secret treaties are old. We have everything to gain by using the new agencies available to us.

The representative of our State Department has told the Nation that this is a matter which requires emergency handling. It cannot be delayed. Greece needs immediate financial assistance. Does this tragic dilemma concern no other country in the world than our own? Most certainly it does. It concerns the entire comity of nations. The peace of the world may be jeopardized by the tragedy unfolding there. Every country on earth should be interested in this situation.

I believe that the proper procedure in the present case is something far different from the Government proposal. We should go directly to the United Nations and urge action there. We should present the question of armed insurrection by a minority of the Greek people to the Security Council. We should urge the United Nations to ask for a joint contribution by all the nations of the earth to alleviate Greek suffering. If there are no other countries which can make such a contribution, our Government should then consider the advisability of making it directly to the United Nations instead of to Greece. Let all the countries represented in this global organization underwrite the enterprise. Let them join with us in this humanitarian effort. If the Greek people are restored to solvency, they will purchase the food they need. They will strengthen their own government, and they will manage to solve the internal problem of their military security for themselves.

This is the pattern for an orderly world. It is a policy of world cooperation rather than of intervention. It removes Uncle Sam from the suspicion of attempting world-wide penetration. Food today is international politics. We must not be guilty of utilizing it as a weapon unless we are ready to fight.

I believe that the people of our country expect a new departure in the conduct of our foreign affairs. We are tired unto the death of the Yaltas and the Teherans and the Potsdams through which the world has passed. For the first time in human history, let the nations resolve to deal the cards above the conference table. If we are to extend aid to Greece, let us do it through the United Nations, by the United Nations, for the United Nations. Turkey is not starving. Its 1,000,000 soldiers, the equivalent of an American Army of 7,000,000, are well fed.

Here in America we have major responsibilities to our own people. We have not yet solved our problems. Let us put them in order before we start solving the problems of the whole world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman please tell the House of what possible value the United Nations could be in the solution of the problem to which the gentleman addresses himself, so long as Russia holds the veto power?

Mr. BENDER. I will be glad to answer the gentleman's question. The United Nations was effective in the controversy involving Iran. It was 100 percent successful in that problem, in spite of Russia's action, in spite of her disposition not to be friendly or cooperative. The United Nations worked in that instance. What in the world are we subscribing to the United Nations for unless we propose to use that Organization as the instrument in these world controversies?

The Committee on Foreign Relations is considering two propositions. One proposition provides for \$350,000,000 to feed the people in Poland, Austria, Hungary, Greece, China, and Italy. On the other hand, they are considering the Truman proposition to implement

Greece and Turkey to the extent of \$400,000,000. It is proposed that we help the satellite countries of Russia. If we are going to fight communism, if we are going to make a frontal attack, then why feed her satellites?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Why should we use this vehicle to implement Russia? If we mean to get tough with Russia, why can we not be honest with ourselves and do this directly.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman was wondering whether or not it was worth while to take the risk to go into Greece and Turkey with this relief. Will the gentleman answer this question? In the early thirties, when Japan moved into Manchuria, and later on when Mussolini went into Ethiopia, and then when Hitler went into the Rhineland, and the democratic nations sat by and did nothing, how then can we sit back and repeat this time what we did last time?

Mr. BENDER. The democratic nations implemented Japan and Germany. Why, we were shipping material into Japan just a few months before Pearl Harbor, not only scrap iron, but we were sending lathes from my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, to Japan. We were implementing Germany as well. We did not boycott Germany and say, "We are going to stop doing business with you, Mr. Hitler." We were doing business with Hitler long after he became Mr. Big.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I noticed in the headlines a moment ago that Russia has offered to lend England money. It looks like we might as well come home if that kind of procedure is going on.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, we have billions of dollars of equipment all over the world that is available to the satellite countries of Russia. Some Russia is buying herself with American dollars.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. There is no reason why Russia should not buy with American dollars. We have turned over all our engraving apparatus to them so that they can turn out our dollars over there.



Mr. BENDER. There is no question about that. You cannot quite understand this crazy, dizzy foreign policy of ours. On the one hand we give them aid, implement and feed them, and on the other we want to fight communism. Overnight everybody in America gets excited about communism. When the Republicans a year or two ago were talking about Communists in the American Government, nobody was excited, but all of a sudden everybody in the administration is all in a dither about the Communists.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman is not saying he is not in favor of fighting communism?

Mr. BENDER. I have been saying that right along. I am against communism and have been opposed to it all the time. But if we are going to oppose communism let us oppose it directly. Let us do it by not doing business with Russia and her satellite countries, by not implementing Russia and making Russia strong. Mr. Roosevelt turned over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Austria, and all these other satellite countries to Russia. They were turned over at Potsdam, at Yalta, at Tehran. These countries were turned over to Russia by the United States Government and by the British Government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the gentleman think that Russia is trying to take over Greece today?

Mr. BENDER. I do not know what Russia is trying to do. I am not a part of their government. But I do know this, that whatever there is in Europe that she has we gave her, we handed it over to her on a silver platter.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish the gentleman would answer my question. Is it not a fact that from the information we have it appears that Russia is trying to move into Greece?

Mr. BENDER. I do not know about that. The gentleman is better informed about that than I am.

Mr. SMATHERS. The gentleman says he is willing to fight communism. Would not that be the first place to fight it?

Mr. BENDER. No. The first place to fight it is right in our own country. The second place is the State Department. The third place to fight it is in all the satellite countries and in Russia.

What do they say about Greece? There are two or three thousand bandits there raising Ned with the Greek Government and this venal monarch of theirs. It is a set-up that is not popular with the people, this fake election they put on in Greece, this Government that the people do not want. By sustaining that Government we are not doing any good. If they cannot cope with two or three thousand burglars who are operating in Greece, then we have no business going over there and supporting that kind of government.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the gentleman admit that the election which took place in Greece was supervised by 637 foreign correspondents from all over the world, and it was certified by them to be

as democratic and free an election as it was possible to get?

Mr. BENDER. Since when did foreign correspondence supervise an election? That is a new one on me. I never heard of that before. My impression about the Greek election is that the Greek election was corrupt. It was a phoney election, and the Greek people protested.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman learn, if he can, from the Members on the other side who seem to be interested in this, whether or not it is their policy that we supervise the elections in these countries, and that if in these countries the ruling power, whether a monarch or whatever it may be, seems inclined to embrace communism, we go in there and tell them what kind of government they shall have? Will the gentleman find out from them?

Mr. BENDER. Is it not amazing that in Poland we permitted the Russian government to get away with the kind of election they conducted over there, yet on the other hand we are talking about this Grecian situation? Is not Poland as important as Greece? Are not the people there as important to us as the Greeks? Are not the Chinese as important to us as the Greeks? We withdraw from China, and we say to the Communists, "Go ahead, this is your happy hunting ground." There are 400,000,000 Chinese, whereas there are only 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 Greeks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about Finland?

Mr. BENDER. Yes, what about Finland, the only country in the world that ever paid its debt to the United States of America. We permit the Russian bear to go in there and just take over, and we say nothing about it at all. In fact, we put blinders on so we cannot see what is going on.

In my remarks last week, I suggested that our President at the behest of the British Government is developing an American policy which fits the needs of a collapsing British Empire. There are several ways of expressing this—we might say that the British have decided to transfer all of their liabilities throughout the world to us and keep the assets for themselves. Another way of expressing the same thing is this—wherever the British have been maintaining a hopeless economic and political situation, they are now asking us to come in and underwrite their mistakes. Still another way of expressing the same thing in financial terms, is this—our President and the British are asking us to pour billions of dollars of taxpayers' money down every international rat hole from Singapore to Constantinople.

Greece today with its corrupt and venal monarchy—Turkey with its military dictatorship, are liabilities to the British—they have cost the British hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. Greece, in particular, represents a British mistake—a mistake because they have insisted on restoring a Greek monarch who does not have the support of

the Greek people. It was also a mistake, Mr. Speaker, because many of the people around the Greek monarch are completely corrupt. The British have discovered that neither the hundreds of millions of dollars nor the flood of UNRRA relief succeeded in achieving a real change for the better in the economic life of the country. The present government is reported to have fattened its own pocket, protecting its own interests, speculating in the black market, and in general making a killing out of the present situation there. Its finances are described as being in complete disorder. Its officials have made no effort to curb the disastrous inflation now rampant in the country. They refuse to share the governmental power with run-of-the-mine, middle-of-the-road political figures; they maintain concentration camps, and general democratic civil liberties exist only on paper.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I call an international rat hole. No matter how much money we pour into such a government, it will do no good because the basic nature of the government itself is corrupt. No matter how much technical advice we furnish, it will do no good because the will to create a democratic government in Greece does not exist in the hearts and minds of the people who decide the policies for this reactionary Greek monarchy. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, for us any more than there was for the British to create a stable political situation in Greece so long as the present monarch is maintained in that nation.

So then, Mr. Speaker, the British are attempting, in my opinion, to give us a half billion dollars a year liability—the accumulated result of their errors in policy. Do we want it? Do we need it? Can we justify it?

Another such endless quagmire is the present Turkish Government which has existed as a venal dictatorship for the past 20 years. The rulers of this Government held a gun to our heads in the recent war. They sold to the Germans; they forced us to pay excessive prices for raw materials; they constantly threatened us with assistance to our enemies; they took several hundreds of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money because they thought it was smart business, and now with a million men under arms, they sit there in Turkey, expecting the American taxpayers to pay with hundreds of millions of dollars every year just to keep them sitting there in happy, little, military dictator-run camp. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, what assurance does our State Department have that after we pay hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to the Turkish Army, because that is exactly what our State Department proposes to do—what assurance does our State Department have that the present Turkish military leaders will not sell out to the Russians, if and when the Russians get into a position to outbid us, or if a real conflict were to develop between us? Does anybody really believe that in the event of a Soviet-American war that Turkey would stand up for 1 week? Would the Turks stand and fight under their present leadership? I do not think

so. I believe they will sell; I believe that in every single situation, the present Turkish Government will look out for its own hide. And in the meantime, it will sell to anybody who will pay the most money. Mr. Speaker, if we begin buying up every international threat, we will have entered a new period in international politics. It will be a period dominated by international blackmail.

Mr. Speaker, does it make sense that whenever anybody stands up anywhere and screams that he is against communism, therefore, automatically we should place him on the pay roll of the American taxpayer at whatever price he says is necessary to keep him screaming?

In short, does our Government intend in this new global policy to hire every dictator or king everywhere throughout the world who will scream "Stop communism!" Mr. Speaker, does it make sense for the British to make our decisions for us, to transfer their liabilities to us? Does it make sense for us to assume every mistake the British have made throughout the world? Does it make sense for us to put on the pay roll of the American Government everywhere in the world any old monarch or miscellaneous political adventurer who says, "Let's all of us boys get together and yell about communism for Uncle Sam at a price?"

If it makes sense to our State Department, I think the time is at hand to change the Department. It does not make sense to the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Lait, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of freight rates in California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

#### DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is well in a great representative body such as this that we have an expression of views such as the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has made and that we have an exchange of views.

One factor contributing to the success of the democratic institutions of government is that in disagreement we respect the views of one another and the right of each other to entertain his or her views.

In taking the floor and characterizing unkindly or sarcastically the views of others, one makes very little contribution toward arriving at what is the right thing to do. My friend from Ohio says he is against communism. I would rather state my position as being that I believe in what my country stands for. I am pro-American, and being pro-American that means I am against any ideology or any institutions which would destroy—or is so aimed—the dignity and the personality of the individual.

My friend says that he is against communism. Yet, he makes a speech which I am not going to characterize because that would not be right, but the effect of his speech would be that we would isolate ourselves from the rest of the world, even if it were contrary to our national interests. I know that he does not mean that. If we follow his argument, however, the result would be the same as if he did mean it.

My views, broadly speaking, on this question have been expressed heretofore on the floor of the House. Twelve years ago I recognized that some day there would be a challenge against the way of life I believe in and another. My way of life has its origin in belief in God. I start with that. That is the basis of our civilization, and every thought I entertain is predicated upon that. The same applies to all of us who believe in God without regard to their religious convictions, whether they are a Catholic or a member of the various Protestant creeds or Jewish. They all believe in one God. The inevitable result of that belief is that the dignity and personality of the individual must always be uppermost in our minds.

That belief is the great truth that forms the firm foundation of the government we believe in. It is all centered around the dignity of the individual and the preservation of that dignity to the fullest measure possible.

Twelve years ago I was chairman of a committee. We recommended legislation against subversive activities and those engaging in them here. The only legislation which has passed this Congress in many years was recommended by the special committee of which I had the honor then to be chairman. One of the most important bills was the Foreign Agents Registration Act, about which you read so much today. I think that has been an effective piece of legislation in meeting subversive activities in America.

We have seen this challenge coming and we have seen country after country taken over. It is very easy to criticize why this was not done or why that was not done. Many of the things to which the gentleman referred were things about which I entertained somewhat similar doubts in my own mind. But we have to view the situation in the light of the world today and in the light of what is

best for the national interests of the United States of America.

I am concerned with the national interest of my own country. As I view it, knowing of the things that do happen when the will of the people in certain countries cannot be expressed and a small minority takes over, with the result that the people become disheartened and tired of fighting for the principles of right and justice, finally the government is taken over by a minority. Then we have seen what ruthlessness follows, illustrated by the case of Yugoslavia which I referred to on July 27 of last year on the floor of the House and again in a speech I made on January 23 of this year, when I said that the Soviet Union was using its ideology to challenge the way of life we believe in, as well as it being a part of its military efforts to encircle America.

Now, I believe that to be a fact. Are we going to sit back and do nothing, or are we going to do something to try to prevent this encircling movement? That is the question. On that question, of course, men may honestly disagree. This is not a party matter. Let me say here that the gentleman from Ohio expressed his own views, and I know that he was not expressing his views as a Republican, but his own honest views as entertained by himself. It may be that between now and when the bill comes up circumstances will develop that may cause the gentleman to change his mind. Knowing the gentleman as I do, if such does happen, I know he would be actuated by what he considers the best interest, the national interest of America.

As I see it, there is a calculated risk if we do something; but there certainly is a calculated risk if we do nothing. The question is, Which is the greater calculated risk? That, as I see it, is the problem which addresses itself to the conscience and the judgment of each Member of the Congress.

The people expect us to know more about this problem than they do, and they are justified, because we are here as their Representatives from the various congressional districts throughout the country. They expect us to know more and they expect us to vote our judgment and our conscience, having always in mind the national interest of the United States of America.

We know that Greece with 7,500,000 people is a pivotal spot in the world today. There is a lot in what the gentleman had to say about China, but our country is not letting China down, our country is interested over there, and it is a national interest. I agree with the gentleman about China, not only for America of today, but because I am looking ahead several generations from now when we shall be dead and gone. I want friendship between the people of China and the people of America to extend to future generations. We, by our actions in the next few years to come, can crystallize and cement it so that Americans for generations to come will be the beneficiaries of our wise actions.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.



Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. I should like to ask the gentleman's opinion on this matter which is involved in this whole question: The crisis in Greece came about as a result of Britain's informing us that she was withdrawing her support of the existing government. Is not that true? That is not my question, it is merely a preface to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that brought the crisis; it brought the necessity for immediate action on our part.

Mr. McDONOUGH. All right. Then, whatever we may do to aid the Greek Government to establish a stabilized government in that country, we do to stop the spread of communism, but we also do something that will aid the British lifeline.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will go along with the gentleman in his first observation, but I cannot concede his last statement. I will go along with the gentleman in the first portion of his statement, although I probably would have expressed it somewhat differently.

Mr. McDONOUGH. My question is: If the crisis in Greece is of such importance to the democracies of the world, why should not Great Britain aid us in establishing stable conditions in Greece instead of asking us to do it alone?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to answer that question; and yet, it is a proper question for anyone to entertain. I cannot answer it except to say that the evidence we have so far as I know is that Britain is unable to carry on her commitments. Now, with Britain withdrawing, the question is: What is the proper thing for us to do for our own national interest?

I think it is unwise for our country to remain inactive and by default allow nation after nation to be taken over by a vigorous communistic minority to be followed by the people's being subjected to ruthless force and then ultimately to be taken within the orbit—I will say this frankly—within the orbit of the Soviet Union.

The country that controls the Mediterranean controls Europe, and the country that controls Europe controls Africa and is a very dominating influence in Asia. I recognize the right of others to believe differently, but what is in our own national interest? Can we sit back and see Europe succumb country by country? Is that in the national interest of the United States? We know what happens, we know what has happened in the various countries over there. Let us assume that a month from now we pick up the papers and find that a small group has taken over Greece. Let us be frank with each other. We know that the Soviet Union directly or indirectly is working in there. In Albania, in Yugoslavia, probably in Rumania, certain elements are working, but back of that is the force and power and spirit of the Soviet Union. Suppose we wake up some day in the near future and find that Greece has been taken over by the Communists. Would we feel that that was for the national interest of our country? Other things are involved if Greece is taken over, a lot of

other things. It is the pipe line to the Middle East, then to the Far East; it is the pipe line right down through that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, suppose 2 or 3 months from now we find Italy has been taken over by the same group. How would we feel? Would we think that would be in the national interest of our country? Suppose, then, we woke up and found 2 or 3 months later that France has been taken over by the minority group. Then, of course, where would Belgium and Denmark be? We know that Sweden, Denmark, and Norway are now under pressure. There is a demand for islands up there. They are under economic pressure. Sweden is under economic pressure. We know that. We know that the Communists in the coalition government in Belgium have withdrawn from the cabinet so they can attack the government in Belgium in the open. What does that mean? Yes; we are vitally interested in China, too, not only because of our affection for the people of China, although we cannot be interested alone because of affection or sentiment, we are vitally interested, as I see it, because the national interest of our country prompts it.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Do we not also have a selfish interest in keeping communism from the other countries of the world because unless we have a free world we cannot sell American goods. The manufacturers, the farmers, the American farmers and laborers, cannot do business in a Communist-dominated country. Is it not, therefore, to our selfish interest to take steps to prevent the spread of communism?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is correct, but there is something bigger, too. There is a moral objective. There is something over and beyond material things, although some of them are very important. There is something we have had for 2,000 years or longer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman who raised the question of the United Nations raises a proper one. I came to this Chamber today not intending to make any remarks. I heard the gentleman from Ohio make his remarks. I am glad he has made his remarks because it is only through discussion that we arrive at a judgment; it is only through discussion we can arrive at the truth where truth is involved or where judgment in reference to a matter of policy concerning the national interest is involved.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. May I ask about this situation: I notice a headline in the morning paper that Stalin has offered a loan to Great Britain. Suppose that Great

Britain were to accept that loan and join the ideological group that Stalin represents, would that have a bearing on the question of the Greek loan from America, in the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if England accepted the loan and joined that ideological group, it would certainly have a serious repercussion throughout the world. I do not know anything about the loan. All I know is what I see in the papers. Whether it is a tactical move by Stalin for world politics or not, I do not know; but if England were to accept the loan, and by reason of that come within the orbit of the Soviet Union, it would have serious repercussions throughout the world and certainly it would be a matter of grave concern to the people of the United States. Now, that is my opinion.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. A good many of our prominent citizens have suggested this problem be taken before the UN. May I ask the gentleman what he thinks Russia would do about the veto if we should take that question to the UN?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will come to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There are two points with respect to the British position.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am trying to speak from the broader angle, and I know my friend has interpreted my statement in that way. I think out of this there is an opportunity for an awful lot of good to come. I do not know whether I will make any contribution or not, but I am attempting to, following the remarks made by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is making a constructive contribution. I think there is a complete answer to the question raised by our friend on this side with respect to Britain's ability at this moment, an official answer, in the 1947 economic survey issued by the Prime Minister to the people of Britain. I think that is a complete answer to Britain's inability to pay and also a complete warning to the people of the United States that unless Britain receives additional substantial credit from the United States Britain must necessarily accept credit from Russia or from some other country. There is no escape from it, because Great Britain's 1947 program calls for certain accomplishments. Three months have passed, and they have not even started on those accomplishments, and in the absence of those accomplishments the \$3,750,000,000 loan extended to Britain by the United States will have failed to suffice, and it is our next move to meet the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, coming from one of the best versed Members of the Congress.

Now, coming to the United Nations. That is a very pertinent question; a very relevant thought. The United Nations, of course, is not even in its infant stage. This is a situation where we have been requested by the Greek Government and the Turkish Government to act. We have been requested to act in connection with the internal affairs of those Governments. The United Nations does not have the money, it does not have the equipment, and it does not have an international police force. It is doubtful whether it has the authority to go into the internal affairs of a country, as such, for the purpose of trying to stabilize it.

Furthermore, this question, if presented to the United Nations, would come before the Security Council, and already, on either 9 or 10 occasions, the representative of the Soviet Union has exercised the veto power. Furthermore, we only had that situation arise a few days ago when the question of the Albanian sinking of a British ship came before the Security Council, and the Council voted 7 to 2 to take some kind of action in connection with that sinking. And who was it that vetoed it? It was the representative of the Soviet Union. Of course, the purpose of communism in its international aspect and its march onward is to try and create uncertainty and confusion and chaos wherever it can among the peoples of a nation that are not directly or indirectly under its domination or control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. One nation, for instance, can resist here and there and then the Soviet Union will probe elsewhere. It and its satellites play upon uncertainty and do all they can to create uncertainty and fear into chaos with the minority then stepping in to wrest the control of government. The Soviet Union, with its international ideology of "Red fascism," is challenging our way of life, and spreading itself wherever it can. It wins by default of the strong democratic nations doing nothing. Now, the question is, can we continue to sit on the side lines and see this done to country after country?

I respect the right of any member who forms an opinion the other way, but my opinion is that we have to take action. The result of this action will help other people, but the motive for the action, as far as I am concerned, is that the national interest of the United States prompts it and requires it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. Would it not have put the United States and the United Nations in a better position, granting that they might have failed, had they joined with Great Britain and taken this matter first to the United Nations, so that

they would not have put the power of propaganda into the hands of the officials of Russia, as we have done, with which they can inflame the minds of the people that we are an imperialistic nation, that we are encircling them, and make them believe that probably we intend to invade their country? Can anyone say that with the power of the peace-loving nations, if it had been taken to UNO, it would have failed?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot agree with the gentleman on that, because no matter what we would have done the Soviet Union would not have been satisfied from the angle of propaganda. If they did not have one thing, they would have another to say about us. Furthermore, we are stepping in there because England is unable to carry on. Furthermore, if we had stepped in with England, then I am inclined to think that many of my friends in this House would have accused our Government of being dominated by British foreign policy, so far as any effort on our part is concerned.

My purpose in taking the floor today is to welcome the opportunity to reply to, and to also welcome the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. Let us have more of this, and let us have a discussion on both sides, without unnecessary charges and recriminations, but on the broad plane of what is best for the national interest of the United States of America. As I view it, the national interest of our country, today and tomorrow, calls for the issue being joined, such as President Truman, in no unmistakable words and manner, joined it in his historic message to this body and to the Senate only a few weeks ago.

#### AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that it is time for us to make up our minds as to whether we intend to become involved in the Greek situation. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts would be the last one to say that we should make up our minds and enter upon a change of foreign policy which may involve us in perpetual warfare without knowing what we intend to do, how far we intend to go. The gentleman says he is pro-American. Of course he is pro-American; so are the rest of us pro-American. The only place we differ, I take it, is as to how we should proceed to best serve the country to which we owe allegiance.

Let me ask this of the gentleman. He believes in the Atlantic Charter, does he not, in carrying the four freedoms to the uttermost corners of the world? I ask for an answer. The gentleman is here. Did he believe in that principle?

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the gentleman's question? He asks the broad question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask the gentleman the broad question whether he believes in

the Atlantic Charter and in particular that portion of it which outlined our duty to carry the four freedoms to the uttermost corners of the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. All of us agree on that. Everybody agrees on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all I want.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman that I was not by implication impugning the motives of anyone. I said my approach is pro-American rather than anti-Communist.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has answered my question, and I thank him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Any time the gentleman asks me to yield I yield, and I do not make any smart answer, either.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Nobody was questioning anyone's motive. What I said was that the gentleman said he was pro-American. I believe him. All I was saying was that the rest of us are pro-American, too; we just differ as to our methods of expressing our desires.

The gentleman answered my question and said that he believed in the principle enunciated in the Atlantic Charter that we were to carry and maintain the four freedoms throughout the world. Then he went on to state that he believed—and I think we all do—in Christianity, and that he was opposed, and I think we all are, to communism. But if the people of Russia want to believe in communism, if the people of India want their form of religion, and the people of a dozen other countries in the world each have their form of religion, how under the Atlantic Charter, I ask you, can we justify ourselves in taking our dollars, our munitions of war, our armed forces, going into those countries and saying, for example, to Russia or Greece or India or China, that they must become Christians, that they must accept our political philosophy? Is that consistent? Is it consistent if we say, as we have said over the years to every nation in Europe and everywhere else except in the Western Hemisphere, that we will tolerate none of their interference with South America or Mexico, but we will cross the sea and stop Russia or any other nation at a designated boundary line? Is it consistent then for us to send our dollars and our armies across the seas to tell Russia or some other country what form of government it shall have?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to ask the gentleman a question that I think is fundamental, that is at the base of all of this. In view of the fact that France has fought two world wars and wrecked herself financially, and that England has fought two world wars and wrecked herself financially, even though we want to do what the President would like to have us do, can we do it and finance it without wrecking this country?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is a very pertinent question. As far as I know, no one from the moment of the President's message down to the present time has ever stopped either to count the cost or even to give the people of our land an estimate of what the cost of the proposed policy



in dollars and munitions of war, in materials, and in men may be.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I think that is the very heart of the whole thing. If somebody could come up with the answer as to how much it is going to cost and where it is going to lead, I think some of us then could make up our minds on what we want to do about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. To my mind he states the point accurately.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Should we not have full particulars as to how much it is going to cost before we embark upon this uncharted journey?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; that is what I understood the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] to be suggesting; especially do we want to know the cost in suffering and cost in lives, possibly an estimate of the number of veterans and the number of dependents of veterans of World War III, and an estimate of how many billions or trillions of dollars would be required to be raised by this country to keep those veterans and their dependents from want and to, as we call it, rehabilitate them.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am reminded of an incident that is recorded in the history of Washington. A former President and his friends way back in the early days of the Republic were sauntering along the bank of the old Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. They had been imbibing a little. One of them slipped into the canal, and the President reached down and tried to pull him out. He could not do it and finally said, "If I cannot pull you out, at least I can get in there and join you."

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. My fear is that we may get in, and with those we seek to aid drown in the sea of want and famine and disease that follows war.

Sometimes I wonder whether in this particular issue we are intellectually honest with ourselves. This thing of communism is nothing new in this country nor to this Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] years ago served on a committee which did a most admirable job in exposing and rooting out the Communists who were in this country. We knew we had them then.

During the 12 short years I have been here, until the time the statement recently made by the administration was given us, nothing was said by those in authority about exposing or eradicating communism or ousting Communists. This has been mentioned here before by me. But we recall how the First Lady of the land went with the Communists and lent them support when they were ordered to appear before the Dies committee. We remember she entertained them at the White House. We remember how the Dies committee attempted over the years to expose and get Communists out of America and out of the Government and how for 10 years, or perhaps more accurately ever since that committee was

created until the time Martin Dies left this Chamber, he was fought on every step of the road. Now, they come along and say, "Yes, our country is going to be overwhelmed by the Communists if we do not help Greece."

When Russia went into Finland, did we help Finland? Did we do anything to help the Finns from being forced to accept and live under communism? To pay tribute to Russia?

As the gentleman from Ohio said, what about Poland and those other countries which Russia took over—some of them with the aid we gave her?

Then, I will come to this question; and this is a practical question. The gentleman says: Do something. Do what? And where? And how much? How many dollars? How many men? How far are we to travel? Under the argument of the gentleman, being Christians and believing in Christianity, are we going to send our forces everywhere in the world to fight every nation which does not believe as we do and which does not accept our theories of government? That gets us back to what—to being an aggressor nation, a nation determined to destroy the choice of other people to live under the form of government they want to live under.

That policy is the opposite of the one set out in the Atlantic Charter; of the reasons given for fighting World War II. If we are to fight another world-wide war let the people know the objectives, in what countries we are to decide who shall be ruler and what is the form of government we are to prescribe. If Communist Russia's \$25,000,000 loan to socialize England brings a communistic England, are we to make war on Britain to oust the Communists? Where, once started, are we to stop?

#### DEMOCRACY VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard, respect, and admiration for the gentleman from Massachusetts. Not only do I have such high regard, respect, and admiration for him, but in the short while I have been here I have learned to have a deep affection for him, and so far, I believe we have agreed on most every matter that has come before this House. But I cannot agree with him on this question of Greece and Turkey.

I believe the gentleman from Ohio is much more nearly correct than the gentleman from Massachusetts. I have not had time to analyze in my mind all of what the gentleman from Ohio has said, but I agree with the substance of what he has said.

I am not fully convinced at this time, as to all the details of the President's proposal, and I will hold my mind open to receive further light and information, because I do want to be right, regardless of what happens to me, on this most important matter.

At this time, however, I believe as firmly as I ever believed anything in my life, that to follow the President of the

United States, fully, on his request, would be an absolute departure from, and a violation of, the spirit, and very probably the letter itself, of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. In addition I am persuaded that to follow his request would be a violation of the spirit and letter of the Monroe Doctrine. It has been said in the press and over the radio that it would be an extension of the Monroe Doctrine. I do not see how you can so extend the Monroe Doctrine without breaking it. I think it would be, not an extension, but a violation of the Monroe Doctrine; and unless I can see further light I cannot and will not go along with the program because I believe that it is a step toward war and I believe we are about to junk the United Nations as we did the League of Nations; and I am opposed to it unless I can see further light.

In my judgment we can and we will stop Russia, or any nation or any group of nations that might come against us, by force; but Mr. Speaker, we cannot, by force, stop communism nor any false religious or political belief in the minds of people. The use of force will only spread it. We can use force to stop any physical enemy that might come against us, but we cannot stop beliefs in the minds or hearts of men by force. No one is more opposed to communism than I am. My whole background in life will show that. In my opinion the only way to stop communism is to make democracy work well in this country. If we do that, we will stop communism in its tracks.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and one with which I agree thoroughly. Does not the gentleman believe that if we impoverish ourselves at home by spreading largesse all over the world we will in effect open the door to communism in this country and be taken over ultimately?

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and observations, and I agree with him fully.

Can we not realize that our old-age pension system is in a deplorable condition and our school system is all but breaking down, that our public debt is almost too heavy for us to bear? Unless we watch our step, we are going to ruin ourselves at home, Mr. Speaker; and if we do, communism will take the world.

#### THE COPPER SITUATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the other day this House approved a bill that had to do with removing the excise tax on copper. We did not have too much debate on that bill, but it has been established that the Federal Government has disposed of most of its copper stock pile consisting of about 600,000 tons.

Where do we find ourselves today? Right flat on our pants with one of the

most terrible copper shortages in the history of the world.

What can you do in carrying on an international program such as has been discussed here this afternoon without copper? What can you do with respect to carrying on a national program to say nothing about the international operations in which we are engaged without a substantial supply of copper?

I think the House did the proper thing the other day.

I attended some hearings in the other body this morning and picked up some additional information.

We cannot work too fast on this copper proposition. There are some reasons why there is a shortage of copper today and the American people are entitled to be told by the Congress of the United States why the present inadequate supply of copper for our industry exists with three copper producing companies practically controlling over 80 percent of the product. We now hold the hot spot on copper. How can industries carry on their fabrications? What is going to happen to the automobile industry in Michigan and other States? What is going to happen to the General Electric Co., Allis-Chalmers, and all the others who produce industrial supplies carrying great quantities of copper to be shipped to the other parts of the world and to our own people here in the United States? That is the question with which this Congress has not yet dealt.

It will be well for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of this House to pay some attention to the 600-page report which has just been released in the last few days by the Federal Trade Commission pointing out some of the troubles in the copper kettle of this country today. We can well afford to have that committee take action and take action promptly in connection with the facts pointed out in the Federal Trade Commission report so that the Congress can thus answer to the people of this country why there is an inadequate supply of copper today with which to carry on our industries and why the Federal Government's supply of copper has been reduced from about 600,000 tons down to about 55,000 tons in the Federal Government's effort to supply those fabricators of copper a few tons to operate in competition with the big three that controls about 80 percent or more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to break into the continuity of the discussion on the Greek and Turkey situation, but I do want to continue some of the remarks I started a while ago when I spoke under the 1-minute rule on the veterans' hospital situation. For the benefit of some of you who came in late, I pointed out and inserted in the RECORD two newspaper articles, one of them from the Seminole Producer, Seminole, Okla., telling about the crowded situation that we have in the veterans' hospitals in Oklahoma and pointing out that as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I have talked to General Bradley of the Veterans' Administration and Major General Hawley, the medical director, many times, giving them statistics from the American Legion's State service officer and the Veterans of Foreign Wars' State service officer, showing that in Oklahoma we have something like 677 cases awaiting hospitalization. Their answer always is that there are no emergency cases turned away.

Recently the entire Oklahoma delegation called on Major General Hawley and discussed this situation with him in an effort to get opened up the McAlester Hospital, the Bordon Hospital at Chickasha and the hospital at Norman which belonged to the Army and Navy. We did not get anywhere. This article I am inserting tells about an Oklahoma veteran from Gore, Okla., who went to the Muskogee veterans' hospital seeking admission. They said he was not an emergency case. The only reason I doubt that is that he died 3 days later. They did tell us the morning the entire Oklahoma delegation called on them that they were going to construct a new hospital in Oklahoma City. I picked up the noon paper today, the Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., and there I note an article that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, had contacted General Bradley and prevailed upon him to delay the awarding of any contracts for veterans' hospitals for a period of 2 or 3 weeks on the ground there were some excessive expenditures or something of that nature in the contracts.

Mr. Speaker, a period of 2 weeks may seem unimportant to many of us, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and General Bradley, but, certainly to the parents of this boy who died down there on March 20 it would be pretty hard to explain.

For the life of me, when the Congress has awarded money which will enable General Bradley to go ahead and award contracts, I cannot see why, just to save a few lousy dollars, we delay this thing for 2 or 3 weeks when down in Oklahoma and all through the Nation we have these veterans waiting to get into the hospitals. Before we start talking about Greece and Turkey and those other places, let us take care of the veterans who fought in the last war. We have down in Oklahoma 677 on the waiting list. If General Bradley gets sick

he can go out to the Army hospital at Fort Myer but what about the 677 in Oklahoma and the 3,500 throughout the Nation; they have nowhere to go unless the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and General Bradley cease frustrating the hospital-construction program. I say to you, before we start anything else, let us do something about veterans' hospitalization in this country. You know you cannot tell the veterans in Oklahoma and the Nation on the waiting list that we will have a hospital for them in 2 years from now when down in McAlester, Chickasha, and at Norman, Okla., we have these Army and Navy hospitals lying idle.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say there were three unused hospitals in Oklahoma?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; two naval hospitals and one Army hospital, sir, which could be utilized. It is the feeling of the Oklahoma congressional delegation these could be used for veterans, at least temporarily, until they can get their new program started, and they are not going to be started unless the gentleman from New York and General Bradley realize the seriousness of the situation and start building hospitals.

Mr. ELLIS. Would not that be a worth-while effort?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. It would be. The trouble is that when you go down and talk to Major General Hawley and General Bradley they quote statistics showing that there is no waiting list. The only thing that we can do, the only thing the Members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation can do, is to cite statistics which are furnished by State service officers of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, showing that there are cases and they are emergency cases. I just know the sense of this Congress well enough to know that something will be done about this.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to no man in my insistence that the disabled of World War II be cared for, but I want to be fair to General Bradley. Is it not true that under the law General Bradley or the Veterans' Administration cannot build for the needs of the so-called non-service-connected cases? They tell me further that there is no delay in getting the veteran hospitalized if he has a service-connected disability.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say this to the gentleman from Connecticut, that they tell us the same thing. The only answer is that many of these cases are service-connected, surely this veteran who died 2 days after being refused admittance was an emergency case.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. They are service-connected?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes. I do not know what you are going to do



when you go over there to the Veterans' Administration and get statistics, when they tell you that these cases are not service-connected and that they are not emergency cases, when right here in this newspaper was the case of an emergency case veteran that they said was not an emergency case, who died 2 days later. He is bound to have been an emergency case.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is what I wanted to know, whether the disability was service-connected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am so informed.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STIGLER. I want to congratulate the gentleman on making such a timely statement informing the Members of the House with reference to the hospital program in Oklahoma. I am just wondering whether the gentleman knows that recently an order was issued by the medical officer in charge of the Veterans' Hospital at Muskogee, calling upon all medical officers not to call him and ask for the admission of any veteran who was not service-connected and not an emergency case. That order was recently issued.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I did not know about that, but I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

As I stated in my speech earlier today Mr. Speaker, I feel very deeply about this matter. I, for one, do not feel that General Bradley is any sacred cow. When incidents occur such as the one I have related, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee I am going to call them to his attention and ask that he do something about it. I cannot see why the hospital construction program should be delayed for even 1 day, and I predict that unless some of these Army and Navy hospitals are utilized temporarily and the construction program pushed with all possible speed, we will learn of other incidents such as this one and we will discover that the boys who fought on the world-wide battlefronts come home to die on the battlefields of Republican economy and Veterans' Administration bungling and red tape.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

#### TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed a bill which will give substantial relief to the overburdened taxpayers of this country and increase their take-home pay. I am sure they will appreciate this legislation, representing as it does a reversal of a trend. I hope we shall be able to cut governmental ex-

penses further so that additional relief may be extended.

Although I voted for this bill, my position in this House is well known to the Members. I am still of the opinion that we have not yet sufficiently recognized the need of the lower-income groups in which I include not only those with net incomes up to \$1,400, after exemptions, who have justifiably received special consideration in the bill just passed, but also those between that figure and up to \$5,000 or even \$10,000. None of us enjoys the day our income tax falls due, but it cannot, in all fairness, it seems to me, be called a real hardship to pay even the existing high taxes for those above the \$10,000 mark, in the sense that they are required to deny themselves some of the real necessities of life in order to help pay the expenses of running the Government.

Entertaining as I do the firm conviction that in our overhauling of the entire tax structure which I trust may be undertaken at an early date, we should give further thought and favorable consideration to additional tax relief for those who need it most, I have today introduced a bill entitled "A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income."

The purpose of this measure is to permit of five additional deductions for what seem to me to be necessary living expenses. This bill would amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code in two respects and would add three new subsections.

In the first place, under existing law, a person is permitted to deduct medical or dental expenses which have been incurred during the taxable year, only when they exceed 5 percent of gross income. That is all right for us here in this body, or for anyone who has an income such that the incurrence of unusual medical expenses, while a tough break, is not actually going to work a true financial hardship. The place where this provision pinches is, let us say, with the \$2,000 a year fellow, who is not permitted to deduct such expenses except those above \$100, or the \$5,000 a year white-collar man who can only deduct his expenses above \$250. These people really feel the pinch acutely when a long sickness strikes, or a major operation becomes a matter of life or death.

My bill would provide for an amendment to section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code so that all such necessary medical and dental expenses would be deductible for income-tax purposes in the case of a man with an adjusted gross income under \$2,000; all such expenses over 1 percent if his gross income is between \$2,001 and \$4,000; all such expenses over 2 percent if his gross income is between \$4,001 and \$6,000; all such expenses over 3 percent if his gross income is between \$6,001 and \$8,000; all such expenses over 4 percent if his gross income is between \$8,001 and \$10,000; and, as under the present law, all such expenses over 5 percent if his gross income is over \$10,000.

This bill, it strikes me, simply gives effect to the increasing ability of a man to meet heavy and unusual medical expenses as his income increases and is a

recognition of the further fact that the lower income groups suffer an unfair discrimination under the existing law, which takes no cognizance of financial ability to meet the cost of medical and dental care.

Secondly, under the present law, interest paid on obligations is, of course, a deductible expense. This is all right for the man who goes to the bank and borrows money, agreeing to pay a certain interest on his note. The trouble is that the little fellow who often cannot get credit at a bank, but who so frequently buys an automobile, a refrigerator, a cook stove, or his household furniture on time, and is, in fact, paying interest on the purchase price is not allowed to deduct that interest because it is said to be unascertainable or not distinguishable. He buys a car on time and agrees to pay for it out of his wages weekly or monthly. Part of the cost of that car is interest, and sometimes abnormally high interest, on the amount of his original obligation. Yet when the tax agent comes along he strikes out of his income-tax return and refuses to allow as a deduction any item for interest. This bill would define the word "interest" as it is used in section 23 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to include either 6 percent of the purchase price, or the interest designated, whichever is greater, on installment purchases.

Again the essential purpose of this bill is only to bring the lower income groups into line with those in the higher brackets who already have the advantage of such a deduction.

Thirdly, a new subsection is added to permit as a deduction all necessary expenses of transportation to and from work. A man, by working, increases his ability to pay income tax and thereby add to the Government revenue. It seems to me only fair that the bus fare or street car fare, which is an absolute necessity to take him to and from his work or to take the girl who works in an office to and from her job, should be a deductible expense item. A business executive can deduct expenses which he incurs for lavish entertainment in order to increase his business. I do not object to that, because undoubtedly the result of it is to enable him to do more business, thereby adding to his income and resulting in higher taxes for him and greater revenue for the Government. But it does seem to me that the cost of getting to and from his job is just as truly a part of a man's or woman's necessary expenses, as some of the deductions which are already allowed.

Fourthly, in these times there are many cases where both husband and wife are working. This becomes even more necessary in times of high prices. It is often highly desirable because the wife has some special skill, such as a nurse's training, or secretarial background which can make a real contribution to our economy. The trouble is that she may have to hire someone to do her housework while she is on the job, or if she has children she may have to pay someone to stay with the children. It seems to me that it is only fair and would be a desirable thing from every point of view if she could deduct these

necessary expenses in computing her income tax.

Finally, my bill would provide that a person who is required to take special instruction or training in connection with his work could deduct such expenses in computing his tax. This would apply particularly to young professional people like teachers, doctors, accountants, nurses, clergymen, and the like. By taking such courses, these taxpayers enable themselves to earn more money and pay more taxes. It would be helpful to our economy generally, as well as a great boon to them to permit them to take such a deduction.

It is my earnest hope that this bill will have favorable consideration before the Committee on Ways and Means and before this House.

#### TAMING WILD HORSES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago, a great "Arkansawyer," Tom Shiras, the editor of a country newspaper in our district, stood at a point in the rugged Ozark Mountains and looked down upon the winding White River below him and made this remark: "A million horses are running wild down there." Tom Shiras was right; and, while he died in the early part of this year, he lived long enough to see part of those horses tamed. He loved northwest Arkansas. I wish he could have lived to see his dream fully realized.

Studies and surveys, made by the Army engineers, have proved that a million horsepower of hydroelectric energy is economically feasible in that majestic river. The tragedy of it is that most of those million horses are still running wild. However, due to the inspired work of men in the Congress, and to the untiring efforts of the people of the watershed of the great White River Basin, we are now at the threshold of a new day. A day when those wild horses will not only be tamed but they will be harnessed and put to work.

There are millions of other horses, still untamed and unharnessed, running wild down the Arkansas, the Red, the Ouachita, the Brazos, the Guadalupe, the Canadian, the Verdigris, the Cimarron, the Neosho, and many other streams in the Southwest. I am sure that the people in these river valleys, like the people who live in our own district, have been working for years to encourage the Federal Government to tame these wild horses and put them to work for progress.

The people have seen these uncontrolled streams year after year carry away the top soil from the farms; a soil which constitutes their line of defense against poverty and distress. You and I have seen the fertility of our soil decrease year by year. It is axiomatic that the welfare of our people is limited by the productivity of the soil. With the loss of our soil goes our hope. Thousands of our farms have literally floated

down our streams and more are following. To be sure, this soil has gone, and is going, down stream to our neighbors in the plains below, where it is not particularly needed. In thus going down stream, it has filled and clogged the beds of the rivers to hamstring navigation and to cause devastating floods which inevitably result in distress, famine, and disease. Indeed, there is great loss in the displacement of soil fertility, in river commerce, and in human welfare. Such waste and suffering in our country are matters of common knowledge.

The people in the hills of northwest Arkansas have joined hands with their neighbors in the valleys; and for 15 years have been fighting side by side for dams, power plants, transmission lines, and other public works which are necessary to make these rivers a blessing instead of a curse. The people in your districts, where they are confronted with the same problems, doubtless have likewise been at work.

The people in the district which I represent have cooperated wholeheartedly with the Corps of Engineers and with all public and private agencies that could aid them. They have appeared at public hearings and have testified to their willingness to have their bottom lands submerged by the reservoirs, if they could, in turn, get: First, flood control for their neighbors below; second, power at reasonable rates for their farms and industry; third, the benefit of the recreational facilities such development would afford; and, fourth, the advantage of the tourist trade which would come with each development. They have cooperated with the private utility companies, and for years have urged them to make these developments.

However, because the local utility companies were more scared than hurt, the cooperation on the part of the companies has not always been what it should have been. They believed that the building of the dams would be to their disadvantage. And all too often, they went into the valleys and tried to persuade the people against power dams by telling them that if power dams were built above them the water would be held at high head levels for power purposes, and that when the rains came the reservoirs would be full and water would be spilled down on the farms; that they would be worse off than before. They told the people in the hills sometimes that if power dams were built that water levels would vary so greatly that the reservoirs would be ruined for recreational purposes. They sometimes told the sportsmen that the fluctuating water level would destroy all of the fish and wild life; and that the building of the dams would ruin the fishing streams in our section.

Fortunately, our people were a little stubborn and plowed a straight row ahead toward the goal of getting these dams built. Some dams have been built; and to show that the utility companies were more scared than hurt, floods are being controlled, recreational facilities are being improved, and the fishing and other recreational activities are better than ever; and, to top it all, the utility companies are making more money than they ever made before—a

proof of the fact that whatever develops the country helps everybody in it.

Another thing I would like to mention, which shows that the utility companies were just scared, was their attitude on rural electrification. Anybody in our district who tried it knows that before the rural-electrification law was passed that the utility companies most generally would not run lines out into the country from the towns which they served, on the theory that it would not pay. I had that personal experience myself; and I know of my neighbors who had the same experience. We did not press the companies for such service. We thought they knew their business; and, if it did not pay, we certainly did not want them to lose money. What distressed us, however, was that when rural electrification finally became a fact, and the Federal Government provided funds to lend to the farmers of the country to build rural electrification lines for themselves, the utility companies, thinking they would be hurt, got busy and built "cream" lines. That is, they picked out the finest territory and built lines and began to serve. The farmers organized their own little co-ops in other sections and asked the local utility companies to give them wholesale rates so that they could serve themselves; but the utility companies, not recognizing the general advantage of this type of service, refused to do it. The Rural Electrification Administration, of course, would not loan the funds to the farmers unless they could get a reasonable wholesale rate. The money lent to the local co-ops had to be repaid to the Government with interest; and, of course, if a co-op had to pay too high for its power, it could not make enough profit to repay the loan.

This situation obtained for some years. The local utility companies, still too short-sighted to see the business advantages, devised a plan which they called the 75-25 or Arkansas plan. This proposal was that if the Rural Electrification Administration would turn the money which was allocated for loan to Arkansas co-ops over to the utility companies, they, in turn, would build the rural lines, tie them on to their own system, collect the bills, and keep 75 percent of the gross receipts and give the Government the 25 percent remaining. Of course, the farmers in our section rejected this proposition as being noncompetitive and leaving them impaled on the same old hook.

In 1937, through the efforts of the State utility commission, which had been appointed in 1936, the utility companies were required to file wholesale rates. Still blind to the advantages of free competitive enterprise, the utility companies offered an unthinkable 18 mill wholesale rate. The State utility commission refused to accept that rate, and the companies finally reduced the rate to 10 mills. Later, when an effort was made through the Tennessee Valley Authority to get power across into Arkansas, the rate was reduced to 8 mills. Later, when the Southwest Power Administration was created, they reduced the rate to 6 mills, and just recently the rate has been reduced to 5½ mills to match the Southwest Power Administration rate. In



these reductions in rates is the proof of the advantage of free competitive enterprise.

Still insisting that competition is a disadvantage, the utility companies do not want the people to tie together the dams which are being built in the streams of the Southwest. They think that to integrate these dams will limit their opportunity to serve the people. But, to show that their real interest has not and will not suffer, the utility companies are making more money than they ever made in the history of their service—indeed, making so much money that they can refund 1 month's light bill out of 12, thereby relieving their own tax burden at the same time. Surely, the little competition afforded by the Southwest Power Administration is and will be only to the general advantage of all concerned. It certainly could not hurt for this reason: At one of the dams in my district, which is representative, the utility companies pay 2.8 mills per kilowatt-hour for the power generated there. In 1945, they sold it through their system right back to the people at these prices: farmers, 46 mills per kilowatt-hour; homes inside city limits, 39 mills per kilowatt-hour; stores, 30 mills per kilowatt-hour; small industries, 18 mills per kilowatt-hour; and both large and small industries on the average, 11 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Now, back to our river projects: As I said, the people in my district believe that we are on the threshold of a new day. The Norfolk Dam located on the North Fork of White River in our district is completed. It has created one of the most beautiful lakes in the country, and many thousands of people visit it each year. The dam has a power plant with one unit of 35,000 kilowatt capacity, which produced 221,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy last year. This plant has room for three more 35,000 kilowatt units. The second unit will be installed next year. Less than 35 miles away is the site of the great Bull Shoals project which will, when completed, add 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

In the Southwest area, 3 projects have already been completed; 5 more are ready to be started; and 22 others are either authorized or recommended for future construction. All of these projects are to be built and operated by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. These developments belong to the people, and the power generated will be marketed by the people. I feel certain that future study will establish many more such projects needed to completely harness our streams.

Now that our people are beginning to see the fruits of their labor and of their money, which they have invested in these dams, the private utility companies have come forward with an offer to buy the advantage of the power developments. They have seen the error they made when they argued against the dams in the first place and are now for them. They have seen the advantage of rural electrification, and they are now for rural electrification. However, still insisting on the general advantage of business without competition, the utility companies have entered into an agreement

among themselves to purchase the power that will be generated by all of these dams and resell it to the very same people who own it—and at rates based upon what the traffic will bear.

Our people, I am certain, want a free competitive enterprise system. They want the public utilities to prosper and make a fine profit, but I am convinced that they are unwilling to permit a group of utility companies to have control over the power generated by these dams. I am certain the people want all these dams to be tied together under an organization to market this power, supplying it to the utility companies, if they want it and need it for distribution at reasonable rates; to the co-ops if they need it for distribution at reasonable rates; to anybody else who needs it for distribution at reasonable rates. This is just plain, simple competition furnished by the owners of the dams, namely, the people themselves.

Competition for the utility companies, such as that supplied by the river projects under the Southwest Power Administration, not only makes power available at more reasonable rates but also makes power available for a wider range of uses in larger and larger areas. Actually, it affords the private utility companies an opportunity to extend their services far beyond what they originally considered would pay a return on the investment so that they may prosper as the people prosper. Within the last few years, while the utility companies have been reducing their rates under the influence of competition, the distribution of power has been greatly extended both as to particular use and as to the geographical area served. But even so, not more than 50 percent—I would say not over 25 percent—of the potential for service is being supplied in my section of Arkansas; and I am satisfied that the same condition obtains in every other part of the State. Thus it is evident that the utility companies need have no fear that the river projects under the Southwest Power Administration will displace them. Rather these projects make it possible and profitable for them to extend their services to still larger and larger sections. As a matter of fact, there is a shortage of power; and it will require the services of all concerned to supply the need.

Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 places the responsibility of marketing all the surplus power from projects developed by the War Department in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior. For our section, the Secretary has delegated that responsibility to the Southwest Power Administration. Last year, the Congress appropriated \$7,500,000 to that administration for construction purposes. Provision was made to construct and acquire a high-voltage transmission line to interconnect the three completed dams, Norfolk, Pensacola, and Dennison; and also for construction of some feeder lines to carry certain power to communities where power was not available. These facilities are now under construction and will be completed as rapidly as possible. When this appropriation was asked for, again the 12 large private utilities in the area, still

unwilling to accept the opportunity to extend their services under competition, came to Washington and fought the appropriation, as they had formerly fought the dams and have fought the Rural Electrification Administration.

This year, the Southwest Power Administration has reduced its budget request and is asking only for essentials for continuance of its services. The appropriation requested is \$3,725,000. These funds will provide three substations on the lines now being built. They will also provide for some additional feeder lines in areas which are not now served. They will provide for general plans and general equipment necessary to maintain lines already under construction.

And again, the power companies offer resistance to this effort to establish free competitive enterprise for public service. Their general arguments are the same. None of the lines which the Southwest Power Administration is now building or proposes to build will in any way duplicate the lines of private companies or take any of their business away from them as I understand the picture. The Southwest Power Administration has done its utmost to cooperate fully with the private companies, yet nine of the companies propose now to take over the contracts of the Southwest Power Administration and purchase all the power of the existing dams in the area. As the Tulsa Tribune said in an editorial of February 24, 1947:

This offer is a campaign to grind up the Southwest Power Administration and feed it as hamburger meat to the private utilities.

The same paper in an editorial on March 1, 1947, says:

There is no need for public ownership of an enterprise in which rates and prices are regulated by competition. That is socialism; but it is not socialism for a people to control an essential need of which there can be but one source of supply.

The fact is that the utility companies now recognize that the Southwest Power Administration is a real success, because the people have achieved the advantages of free competitive enterprise. They speak of interference with free enterprise, but they never speak of free competitive enterprise. It appears that they just do not want competition, which is very inconsistent in the American system, to say the least. Could it be that while the "wild horses" in the rivers are being tamed, the utility companies also need to be tamed?

It is my considered judgment that the power projects under the Southwest Power Administration offer only advantages to the people, including the private power companies. I know that the people I represent want the Federal Government to build the dams and to tie them together with a high-voltage grid system with necessary feeder lines to take this power to the people and at rates that are reasonable and at least competitive. We believe that such a policy will encourage the private companies to continue to grow and prosper. The program of the Federal Government will supplement the power of the private companies and aid in the rapid development of our

region. Our region abounds in an abundant supply of cheap fuel in the form of gas, oil, and coal. Private companies will have developed steam-generating plants using these cheap fuels. The Government will develop hydroelectric plants, it being unreasonable to expect the private utility companies to build all the dams necessary to harness all the potential power along these streams. A proper balance and coordination of the hydro and the steam plants will produce the cheapest power and extend its uses to every farm home and to the smallest industry.

The Government's program could materially aid private companies by supplying them capacity for peaking purposes. Private companies could aid the Government by selling them energy to firm up its capacities in the hydro plants. Teamwork could produce the best results in our region; and teamwork is what we are desirous of obtaining. Plain, simple, unadulterated justice and fairness to both the people as a whole and to the utility companies is all that we ask, in order that progress can lift up her head, and ultimately return to the people the money that they have invested in all these projects, at the same time retaining the advantages of these projects for posterity.

Yes; we are taming wild horses—the wild horses running down our streams.

Horses, which, when harnessed, will furnish heat and light to homes and power for industries all over northwest Arkansas, over the great Southwest, and throughout the whole country according to the need, and at rates that can be afforded. These horses belong to the people and when they are harnessed they should and must work side by side with free competitive enterprise—a system that made this country what it is, and will keep it strong and vibrant.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

499. A letter from the Chairman, National Archives, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

500. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting a copy of the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1946 (H. Doc. No. 185); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

501. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize an adequate White House Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

502. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1948 in the form of an amendment to the

budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 186); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

503. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed amendment to the 1948 budget as it pertains to the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 187); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 152. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of Virginia sun-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2849. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2838. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 2839. A bill to amend title V of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, so as to provide that the transferee of any property transferred thereunder shall be entitled to all revenue derived from such property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2840. A bill relating to the assumption of contractual obligations by the Federal Government to make grants-in-aid with respect to Federal-aid highways and roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 2841. A bill to authorize the construction of certain Federal reclamation works in the upper basin of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2842. A bill to provide that retired enlisted personnel of the Army who served as commissioned officers during World War II shall receive the pay of retired warrant officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 2843. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain property to the Navy Department for the purpose of establishing a naval postgraduate school at Fort Stevens, Oreg.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2844. A bill to amend the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 by removing therefrom certain inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 2845. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with the national defense, and

for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (by request):

H. R. 2846. A bill authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2847. A bill to provide for examination and investigation of inventories of Government-owned property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 2848. A bill to suppress the evil of anti-Semitism and the hatred of members of any race because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 2849. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2850. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 2851. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 2852. A bill to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek Recreational Demonstration Area, in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2853. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2854. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and subchapter B of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. REEVES introduced a bill (H. R. 2855) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Naka Matsukata Rawsthorne, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

283. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, City and County of San Francisco, that the budget of the Customs Bureau be not curtailed so as to render its operations ineffective; to the Committee on Appropriations.

284. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition signed by 54 citizens of East Liverpool, Ohio, favoring the immediate admission of 100,000 Jews from Europe into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

285. Also, petition signed by 65 citizens of Freeport, Ohio, favoring Senate bill 265, by Senator CAPPER, to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers, periodicals, radio broadcasts, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.